

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
HAMMOND DIVISION**

JONATHAN DAVID WOOLSEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

CAUSE NO.: 2:22-CV-12-TLS-JPK

CORTNEY NA WOOLSEY n/k/a ROBSON,

Defendant.

**OPINION AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on a Motion to Reconsider Remand of Removal [ECF No. 8] filed on February 3, 2022, by Defendant Cortney Na Woolsey n/k/a Robson. For the forgoing reasons, the Court denies the motion.

The Defendant removed Plaintiff Jonathan David Woolsey's Motion to Modify Judgment of Divorce Regarding Custody, Parenting Time and Child Support [ECF No. 3] to this Court from the Cass County, Michigan, Circuit Court on January 19, 2022. Notice of Removal, ECF No. 1. The Plaintiff filed Plaintiff's Answer Objecting to Removal Sought by Defendant [ECF No. 6.] on February 1, 2022. The Court, sua sponte, remanded the case to state court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on February 3, 2022. Feb. 3, 2022 Op. & Order, ECF No. 7.

The Defendant asks this Court to reconsider the order remanding the case.<sup>1</sup> However, "it is universally held that once a federal district court remands a case and mails a certified copy of its order to the state court, the district court loses all jurisdiction, even if it later changes its mind." *City of Valparaiso. v. Iron Workers Local Union No. 395*, 118 F.R.D. 466, 468 (N.D. Ind.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Defendant does not cite the rule under which she seeks reconsideration.

1987) (cases cited). The relevant statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d), provides that, except in cases removed under sections 1442 (federal officers or agencies sued or prosecuted) and 1443 (civil rights actions), remand orders are not reviewable on appeal or otherwise. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d). Removal is to be strictly construed and “is not only in the interest of judicial economy, but out of respect for the state court and in recognition of principles of comity.” *City of Valparaiso*, 118 F.R.D. at 468. Because this Court has no jurisdiction to reconsider its remand order, the Defendant’s motion is denied. *See Pickard v. Central States Se. and Sw. Areas Health & Welfare Fund*, No. 02-C-0282-C, 2003 WL 23104276, at \*1–2 (W.D. Wis. Feb. 12, 2003) (denying motion to reconsider court’s remand order because the court no longer had jurisdiction).

Based on the foregoing, the Court DENIES the Motion to Reconsider Remand of Removal [ECF No. 8].

SO ORDERED on February 7, 2022.

s/ Theresa L. Springmann  
JUDGE THERESA L. SPRINGMANN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT